

67988/1

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

ENQUIRY

ABOUT THE

LAWFULNESS

OF

Eating BLOOD.

In Answer to

*The REMARKS of the Apostolical Decree at
Jerusalem prov'd to be still in Force.*

By a Prebendary of YORK. [Thomas

Shan

With some REMARKS on the Defence of
Revelation examin'd with Candour.

L O N D O N:

Printed for JOHN PEMBERTON, at the
Golden Buck in Fleetstreet. MDCCXXXIV.

(Price Six-Pence)

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Wellcome Library



A

DEFENCE of the ENQUIRY &c.



WHEN I first enter'd upon the *Enquiry*, for the Satisfaction of a Friend; who was thrown into Doubts, by the two Dissertations in *Revelation examin'd with Candour*; I had no other View, than fully and impartially to examine what is there offered——And as I have a Veneration for that Ingenious Author, and no strong Appetite to what I am pleading for the *Lawfulness* of; if I have not treated both the Subject and its Author fairly, I should think myself much to blame.—If the Reader should happen to think otherwise, I must intreat him to ascribe it to Ignorance, or, what I own is but a bad Plea, to Hastiness. However, whatever Errors I have run into, no body shall with greater readiness than myself give them up, as soon as they are discover'd.

The Learned Author of the *Remarks* has pointed out some things which he looks upon to be Mistakes; and has done it with so much *Temper* and *Meekness*, as to set me a good Pattern to follow; which I shall endeavour to do so closely, that I hope he will have no room to complain of either *censorious Judgment* or *railing Accusation*. It is as natural for Men to differ in Judgment, as in Stature; and every Man has a right to vindicate and defend his own; which so long as he does in a modest and inoffensive way, no body can blame him for it.

The Author of the *Remarks* has pitched upon so few things in the *Enquiry* to make his Observations upon, that the Dispute between us two will not be very long. He has refer'd me to the *Apostolical Decree at Jerusalem* for my Satisfaction in several of them; which it seems was written before mine came to his hands.—As that is in Answer to the Author of the *Question about eating of Blood stated*, I shall not presume to intermeddle with any points I am not concern'd in; but leave them to be discussed betwixt them two; and in one particular with relation to the Precept given to *Noah*, upon which great stress is laid, I have examin'd a little into what is further urged in the *Defence of Revelation examin'd with Candour*, written likewise in opposition

fition to the *Question stated*.——If I was to trace out some more of *their* Reasonings upon this Subject, that seem to me inconclusive, I should only forestall a much abler hand: and throw myself into a far greater length than I am at present disposed to go.

There are two points, in which I am so happy, as to be thought to be in the right by the Author of the *Remarks*; the one in rejecting the Notion of the *Antediluvians* Charter reaching to the flesh of living Creatures for food——in this I opposed the Learned Author of the *Question stated*: But as I could not then (and upon farther Consideration cannot yet) find, that it would any way affect the Subject in dispute, I did not dwell so long upon that, as I did upon the other, in showing why the *Apostolical Decree* should not be confined to the *Gentile-Profelytes*.——

I shall not think it any diminution of what I offered upon these Topics, to own, that Man's dominion over the beasts of the field and fowls of the air, without making use of them for food, is described in a very beautiful, elegant and entertaining way by the Author of *Revelation Examined*. * And that the Apostles made Converts from Idolatrous and Non-Profelyted Gentiles before the *Decree at Jerusalem*

* The Doctrine of Abstinence from Blood defended.——

salem was made; consequently the Jewish Profelytes could not be the only Persons it was designed for, is proved in a satisfactory manner both by the same Author and by the Author of the *Remarks*.

There are some other opinions the Author of the *Remarks* very justly takes notice of, that tho' I have proposed them to my Reader, and left them to him, to judge what weight there is in them; yet I have passed them by, as if I thought there was none in them myself.—Thus far we are both agreed.

But then, there are other things * I insist on, which the Author of *Revelation examin'd with Candour*, has already insisted on at large—It may be so; and yet not be improper for me to mention them, to make my Sentiments appear the better connected—a Man must be a thorough Adversary that will oppose *every* thing—such a Temper as this, I would not be thought to be of.—As I have mention'd some Opinions of others, without signifying my approbation; that the candid Reader may judge of them as he thinks proper: so, I hope, I may borrow from this ingenious Author, what I apprehend would be serviceable to my own purpose, without giving him offence or any body else.

There

* Apost. Decree yet in force, p. 60.

There is one passage indeed, which the p.⁶⁸. Author of the *Remarks* lays his fingers upon as a strange oversight. I will give it you—the Author of the *Enquiry* says, p. 16, 17, “ The chief reason why *Noah* “ should not be allowed the use of Blood “ for food, is expressly assigned; because “ *it is the Life of the Beast*, and was ap- “ pointed as proper Sacrifice for Sin—— “ and upon what account this was not “ insisted on by him (the Author of *Re- “ velation examin’d*) as a reason why we “ should not make use of Blood for food, “ seems to me to be pretty plain—How “ this Observation, says the Author of the “ *Remarks*, could be made by the Enqui- “ rer, I cannot understand; when it is so “ plain, that the Doctor largely insists on “ this reason; and is set down in the Con- “ tents p. 11, 12, 13, 14, and again “ p. 15, 16.”

I must freely own that I did not, nor could any one well, overlook what the Doctor *so largely insists on*—and I must own too, that the manner of my putting down the last Clause, might give an *unwary* Reader room for the Reflection—— a small addition would have made my meaning clear, and then it had been thus; “ Up- “ on what account this was not insisted “ on by him, as *the only* reason, why we “ should not make use of Blood for food, “ seems

“ seems to me to be pretty plain.—The Doctor insists on’t as a Reason—and I, as the *only* reason of the Prohibition—there is only that Difference between us.—That this was my meaning, might have been collected from the beginning of the Paragraph, “ the chief and *what seems to me the only satisfactory reason*, why Noah should not &c.—Omissions, I find, may happen to others as well as myself—I will not lay it to our Author’s charge that it was done designedly—perhaps he might not look upon that as the drift of my argument; tho’ a Person of his Sagacity, one would think, could not well miss my meaning, if he did but suspend ’till he was gotten to the next Paragraph, which I will, for the Satisfaction of the Reader, beg leave to recite.

“ If God, who determin’d in *the fulness*
 “ *of time* to send *his Son* into the World
 “ to redeem it by the Sacrifice of himself,
 “ thought it fit in the mean while to en-
 “ join the Sacrifice of Creatures, that Men
 “ might be the better prepared to submit
 “ to this Appointment and understand the
 “ reason of it——and if no Sacrifice
 “ could be made without effusion of
 “ Blood; *without shedding of Blood is no*
 “ *remission*—therefore in order to appro-
 “ priate Blood to this particular use; and
 “ to dignify and distinguish it from other
 “ things;

“ things; which is the meaning of sancti-
 “ fying and making holy; he might
 “ not suffer it to be made use of as food;
 “ and thereby create a Respect and Vene-
 “ ration of it in the Minds of Men——
 “ consequently when there was a full end
 “ of all Sacrifices; *Christ by one offering ha-* Heb. x.
 “ *ving perfected for ever them that are* ^{14.}
 “ *sanctified*: there could be no need that he
 “ *should offer himself often*, or that the
 “ Blood of other Creatures should continue
 “ to be offered, and then there would be
 “ no further occasion to separate it from
 “ other things; and so it might be taken
 “ into the common uses of Life.—In a
 “ word, if Blood was prohibited because
 “ it was appropriated to the Altar; then,
 “ when there was an end of such Sacrifices,
 “ we may conclude there would be an
 “ end of the Prohibition too.” And that
 this is what I insisted on, will appear
 more clearly if we go on to p. 22.—“ In
 “ order to undeceive them and diminish
 “ that high Esteem they had of the Efficacy
 “ of Blood, *our blessed Lord* abolishes
 “ and renders useless all Sacrifices whatsoever
 “ by the completeness of his own; and when
 “ *they* ceas’d, the *only* sufficient Reason for
 “ prohibiting Blood ceas’d with them; and
 “ when it was not any longer to be *inclos’d*
 “ for holy purposes, it might be thrown
 “ open as common food——

From the small Emendment and the two Passages above, I hope my Argument and the Conclusion from it, may now be understood.

I am well aware (I cannot overlook *them*) that there are other Reasons of the Prohibition assigned by the Author of *Revelation examin'd*, and some by the Author of the *Remarks* in concurrence with him, which I shall desire to consider, before I go any further; because much Stress is laid on them, and they are thought to invalidate my conclusion. They give the preference indeed to that I make the *only* reason——*i. e.* that Blood is forbidden because it was *to be pour'd out upon the Altar*: Yet they subjoin several others to it—as first, to be “ a perpetual monition to
“ Mankind, that God was the Author
“ and Giver of Life. 2dly, to prevent
“ unnecessary cruelty in the Use of Crea-
“ tures. 3dly, to keep us from a too high
“ and luxurious way of living, which
“ might fill us with choler and cruelty.
“ 4thly, to keep us from falling into Idola-
“ try.”——

I ask whether these are reasons that God has any where given for this Prohibition, or are they the Inventions of Men?—We find no Account of them, that I can see, either in the Command to *Noah* to abstain; or in the more express Declaration of the same in the Law——To *Noah* it runs thus,
Flesh

Flesh with the Life thereof, which is the Gen. ix.
Blood thereof, shall You not eat—in the Law ^{4.}
 it is thus, *for the Life of the Flesh is the* Lev. xvii.
Blood, and I have given it to you upon the Al- II.
tar, to make an atonement for your Souls;
for it is the Blood that maketh atonement for
the Soul.

It is not a little surprizing to me, how the Author of the *Remarks* should find fault with the Learned Mr. *Shuckford*, for making the *Jewish* account explanatory of that to *Noah*—as if that to *Noah* was no more than a recognition, that *God was the Author and Giver of Life*—and that they might make use of Blood for an atonement, was a second reason given to the *Jews*.—If this was so, would it not follow, that none but the *Jews* had a Power of making use of Blood in Sacrifice? or at least, it would follow, that this Precept to *Noah* gave neither him nor his descendants any Power over Blood at all; and are we to suppose that it was not made use of by them for sacrifice, 'till this grant was made in the Law, which would be obligatory upon none but the *Jews*?—The Precept to *Noah* is *general*, and it may well be ask'd, as it frequently is, if they are debar'd from eating it, how does it follow from thence that they may use it for sacrifice?—The best reason, that I know of, is assign'd in the Precept itself; because *the Blood is the Life*; and therefore should

not be *eaten*: but reserved for the Altar—And that it is so to be interpreted, we have a Confirmation, from this reason being more fully explain'd and enlarg'd in the Law—it is very odd that our Author should find fault with any that take this liberty, because he makes use of it in another case, exactly parallel, to serve his own purpose, as will be seen by and by.

And indeed to do him justice, he seems to give up not only this Criticism; but likewise the other reasons for the Prohibition; which the Author of *Revelation examin'd* is so zealous for—these are his words. “ 2ly,
“ Let it be allow'd that even the original
“ reason given to *Noah* against eating of
“ Blood, had *only* a respect to Sacrifices”—How then can he avoid the conclusion? that, when there was an end of Sacrifices, there must be an end of the Prohibition too.—*Cessante ratione, cessat Lex*, is a Maxim which nobody will dispute.—Our Author leaves this Precept to *Noah*, about which so much bustle has been made, and flees to the Apostolical Decree, and owns that “ had it never passed, this arguing might
“ have been allow'd to have some force.”

The Author of the *Question stated* has urg'd this Argument, and looks upon this Reason assign'd for the Prohibition to be so strong and satisfactory, “ that we need
“ not torture our Imagination to search
“ for others of less force and significancy”—
and

and after adds, “ As to the rest of the reasons
 “ assigned by this Author (*Revelation ex-*
 “ *amin’d*) for the Prohibition; wherein he
 “ mentions the fierceness of carnivorous
 “ Animals; the fastidiousness of flesh Diet;
 “ and that Blood is apt to breed *choler*, and
 “ therefore maketh Men *choleric*; I do not
 “ think that they have weight enough in
 “ them to require an Answer.”

The Author of *Revelation examin’d* kindles at this, and gives us too clear a proof that something besides Blood can raise *choler* *. I wish he had consider’d things coolly, and written this Defence of his Dissertations with the same *Candour* he has written the Dissertations themselves; and then we should not so often have met with, *no Man in his Senses; no Man of common Sense*, can think this or that.—What a home thrust does he give his Adversary in the beginning? “ After a most careful and
 “ candid Enquiry, I can find nothing in
 “ it, but a Series of surprizing Errors
 “ (however learned and ingenious) with
 “ very little interruption from the first
 “ Paragraph to the last——a Book in
 “ which he has been so unfortunate, in
 “ my humble Opinion, as to advance no
 “ one Proposition, directly or indirectly,
 “ against the doctrine he would defeat,
 “ which is not manifestly repugnant either
 “ to Scripture, Reason, Antiquity, Expe-
 “ rience, or all these at once.”

What

* Defence of the Doctrine of Abstinence from Blood.

What were those Friends a-doing, to whose Judgment, where he suspected his own prejudices or the byas of his temper, he submitted? they might sure have *softened* this passage——what an unfortunate Man is he, not to have *one* Proposition but what is so repugnant!--this is to blow him up at once--and must give a Man pain, that shall think to take his part——however, as I have fallen into one of these *repugnancies*, I must be so hardy as to own it; and endeavour to defend the Scripture-reason for Abstinence from Blood to be sufficient——if Persons of a fine Genius or strong Fancy can find out other reasons, which may bear some affinity to the thing, or be of use to Mankind, with all my heart.——only let me beg of them not to lay too much weight on them; nor urge them to have Strength enough to support a Precept, when the Scripture-reason of that Precept is taken away.—

To keep Blood from common use, and to appropriate it to the Altar, in order to prepare the way for the reception of the great *Christian* Sacrifice, upon which our Salvation depends, is a *great* and *noble* Reason; *strong* enough of itself; what the Wisdom of the Deity might pitch upon *alone*, as *sufficient* to justify the Prohibition—and therefore we need not perplex ourselves in finding out others——

The Author of the Defence, asks, “ Is
 “ then the recognizing of God, as the
 “ Author

“ Author and Giver of Life, a reason of
 “ no weight?”—Admit it be; is there
 no way of recognizing it but by such a
 Precept? The giving to *Noah* and his Descen-
 dants an Authority of *killing* and *eating*
 every Creature that was good for food, is
 a more proper recognition of this Power;
 and his reserving out of the Grant the Blood,
 may be purely and solely for that end, that
 it may be reserved for Sacrifices—

As to the Authors cited and Advantages
 assigned for the *invented* Reasons, let them
 have their proper weight: but by no means
 to preponderate the *Original one* given by
 God himself; nor to be made *sufficient* to
 keep up the Observance of the Precept,
 when that *other* shall happen to cease, as is
 contended for in the present case.

I cannot see how Commentators, and
 Preachers, as this Author urges, should be
 thought a very useless and insignificant Set
 of Mortals, in case they were to be con-
 tent with the Reasons *Providence* is pleas'd
 to give—they may have useful Business
 in reading the Word of God and in ex-
 plaining the meaning and reasonableness of
 the Doctrines and Precepts, contain'd in
 it—and if they can think of other rea-
 sons well worthy of the Wisdom and
 Goodness of God, they may add them; but
 not to put too much Confidence in them,
 so as to make them do alone; nor any,
 when the Scripture-Reason ceases or is re-
 jected.

jected.—There is an odd Passage, or at least it appears so to me, in the conclusion of this chapter——“ At least I am sure I cou’d not
 “ reject the Decree, tho’ I should *despise* the
 “ Reasons assigned for it.”——I leave it to the Author to reconsider, whether a Decree is not to be rejected, when the Reasons assigned for it are to be *despised*.——The next Paragraph will not help the matter much;
 “ tho’ the Reasons of any divine Law were
 “ too hard for me,” *i. e.* I suppose, out of my reach or strength——if they are, that sure will not be assigned as a good Reason why they shou’d be *despised*——this cannot be a *thinking thereupon with Reverence*.

p. 67. The Author of the *Defence* says, “ If
 “ Abstinence from Blood had been en-
 “ joined merely and solely, because the
 “ Blood of the Sacrifice was a *Type* of the
 “ Atonement made by the Blood of Christ;
 “ then it would follow, that this Absti-
 “ nence should cease from the moment of
 “ our Saviour’s Passion, *i. e.* from the mo-
 “ ment that the Atonement was made for
 “ the Sins of the whole World.”——The

p. 69. Ingenious Author of the *Remarks* calls up-
 on me to take notice of what the Author
 of *Revelation examin’d* had urged, “ that
 “ the Apostolical Decree against Blood was
 “ pass’d many Years after the Atonement
 “ was made;”——It looks as if both of
 them thought that there was a great deal
 in this Argument.

Well,

Well, we allow, that Abstinence, *i.e.* the Command of Abstinence, from Blood, did cease that moment——why, what follows?—there's a strange sequence put in the Margin of the Defence, “ It would follow, that “ no Blood should be abstain'd from but that “ of the Sacrifice from the very beginning.”——I am not very sure that I^{p. 67.} understand him right; if I do, I declare that I am not able to find out any such Consequence——*all* Blood, or at least, as the Author of the *Remarks* urges, *all* separate Blood, was forbidden to be made use of as food, and was appropriated to the Altar, and this we say was to continue 'till the great Sacrifice was made by the death of *Christ*; and there being an end of all bloody Sacrifices, the Reason of the Prohibition ceas'd, and then it might be taken, as well as flesh, into the common uses of Life.——I cannot conceive how it should get into our Author's head, that from the Precept to *Noah* to the death of *Christ* it should follow from hence that no Blood should be abstain'd from but that of the Sacrifice, when the Precept to *Noah* forbids Blood in general; and the *Jewish* Precepts are so expressly against such a notion. It is very observable, that a great many, who can write closely and connectedly out of Controversy, when they are once engaged and *blooded*, are carried into strange Consequences and Inconsistencies. The^{p. 69.} Learned Author of the *Remarks*, says, “ the
C “ Apostles

“ Apostles instead of repealing, confirmed
 “ the *Prohibition of eating Blood*——and
 “ the Universal Practice of the Church, is a
 “ plain Proof, that she did receive the *Apo-*
 “ *stolical Decree*, not as a *Repeal* but as a *Con-*
 “ *firmation.*”——The Author of the De-
 fence has put this more formidably; when
 he pleads that the Apostles were ignorant
 that this “ Abstinence ought to cease from
 “ the moment of our Saviour’s Passion; o-
 “ therwise it were impossible they could act
 “ so absurdly, as to re-enjoin the Absti-
 “ nence so many Years after the reason of it
 “ had entirely ceas’d.”——The Conse-
 quences from this Conduct of the Apostles
 are dreadful; and “ therefore either this
 “ Learned Author’s (*Question stated*) Opi-
 “ nion is very erroneous; or the Apostles
 “ could not be what they pretended,
 “ divinely inspired: The Reader will em-
 “ brace which part of the Disjunction he
 “ thinks most reasonable.”

In what a comfortable Situation is the
 Author of *Question stated* placed before the
 Reader? and yet after all this outcry, what
 is there in it? no more than the paintings of
 a lively Imagination——if the Reader can
 see much in this reasoning, he is too hard
 for me.——Supposing the Apostles did know
 that the Abstinence from Blood ceas’d at the
 great Sacrifice; and that all Men were at li-
 berty to eat or not eat, as they thought
 proper——supposing also, that they knew
 that

that *all* had not this Knowledge, and that the *Jews* were zealous for the Law; and might be offended, if they preached up this *Christian Liberty*; would their Silence in such a Case be Criminal?—As there was no Immorality in it, People might either eat or forbear, 'till such time as offence was taken by the believing *Jews*, that the other Converts were not to pay a respect to the Law, and upon that account they would be ready to revolt—What absurdity, pray, could there be in the Case, for the Apostles to enjoin this Abstinence, to heal those breaches, which the Contentions in the Church of *Antioch* might occasion?—And if it was necessary to abstain, it could be on no other account that I can see, than to make up those dissensions and divisions, which otherwise might have been of fatal consequence.—That the Decree was made at a great distance from our Saviour's Death, is objected—but upon what other footing can they so well account for it as we can upon this?—I will give you an Answer to it in the Words of the Learned Mr. *Shuckford*, * “ The use of Blood upon the Altar is
 “ now over, and therefore the reason for ab-
 “ staining from it, is ceas'd.—And tho' the
 “ Apostles at the Council at *Jerusalem*, that
 “ offence might not be given the *Jews*, *advi-*
 “ *sed* the *Gentiles* at that Season to abstain
 “ from it; yet the eating it or not eating it
 “ is no part of our Religion; but we are at
 “ perfect Liberty in this matter——

* Connection of sacred and profane Hist. V. i. p. 97.

p. 61.

There is an odd Paragraph in the Defence, that gives a further reason of this Abstinence, which, if I understand it right, is capable of an easy solution. “ Will this Learned Author (*Question stated*) assert, that Blood “ was not abused to the purposes of Idolatry, “ or that God did not foresee that it would? “ for, if he foresaw it, that was a good reason “ for prohibiting it.”

So then the Precept to *Noah*, if I hit his meaning, must have this Construction put on't—that they were prohibited both from eating and using it in Sacrifice—But where is there one Word of the latter in the text? The abovemention'd Author says, “ the Injunction of not eating Blood, has in the place before us, (the Command to *Noah*) no Circumstances to explain its meaning—but if “ we look into the *Jewish* Law, we find it “ there repeated; and such a reason given for “ it, as seems very probable to have been the “ first *original* reason for this Prohibition.—

That Sacrifices were the positive Institution of God, is of late pretty much agreed; and that the Antediluvians were allow'd and actually did offer the Creatures in Sacrifice, is not much denied.

Gen. iv.
4.

We read that *Abel*, for an Offering to the Lord, brought of the firstlings of his Flock and of the fat thereof.—If it had not been on the account of Sacrifices, how would there have been a distinction of Beasts into *clean* and *unclean*? nay, to put the matter out of all dispute, *Noah* himself before he had any power given

Gen. vii.
2.

given him over the Creatures, offer'd them in Sacrifice ; *Noah builded an Altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean Beast and of every clean Fowl, and offer'd Burnt-Offerings upon the Altar.*—But I need not urge this to the Author of *Revelation examin'd*, who has well establish'd this Opinion in his excellent Dissertation upon this Subject--therefore it is a wonder to me, how he should suggest that Blood was forbidden to prevent Idolatry.

Noah, when he had a Grant of living Creatures for food, is prohibited eating Blood, and that is all—not one word is said to restrain him from offering it in Sacrifices, as they had usually done.--From that they might reasonably conclude, that their former practice was to be continued—if a not *repealing* could be looked upon as a *Confirmation*, here is one.—If we need say any more in answer to the Objection, we must appeal to the *Jewish Law*, which manifestly clears up this Point, and shews the use that Blood was restrain'd for.

If Persons mistook the proper Object of Adoration, and offer'd Sacrifice to what was not God ; which a great many certainly did, and God foresaw they certainly wou'd ; yet they are under no restraint, that I can see, as to what they offer'd--the whole blame is in the wrong application of it.

If the Antediluvians were prohibited the use of living Creatures for food, and yet were enjoin'd to offer them up in Sacrifice, that they might be a *Type* of the great Christian Sacrifice, and it was their practice, before the Flood, so to do ; when *Noah* had a grant of living Creatures for food, with an exception to Blood ; wou'd it

it not be natural for them to conclude that exception was made purely to separate Blood from common use, and to appropriate it to the Altar; and so they might continue to make use of it according to former practice, when nothing was said against it here.—This seems to make it pretty clear, if it wants any farther Illustration; it is expressly and evidently set forth in the Law, that the *Blood was given to make an Atonement.*

p. 45. The Author of the *Remarks* cannot find fault with our taking an Explanation of this *general* Command from the Law, when he has done so in the very same case, to find out what is meant by *Blood* in this Precept—these are his Words; “ ‘Tho’ the Precept given to *Noah*—is not so explicit; and only forbids the eating Blood in “ *general*; yet the Law of *Moses* is more express, “ and may be of use to us to determine this mat- “ ter.”——and so I hope it may be of use to us to determine that other matter.—I should not have pursued this Argument so far, had it not been the same with my own, which I had gone upon before the *Question stated* came into my hands; and I must own, I can see no sufficient reasons to quit it, notwithstanding what these Ingenious Gentlemen have offer’d against it.

The Author of the *Remarks* takes notice of a Passage of mine, which I thought could not have been mistaken——these are his Words; “ ‘To prove that it was only *necessary* that the Gen- “ tiles should be restrain’d from these things, that “ no offence might be given to the *Jews*, it is “ argued, that they, who came over to Christi- “ anity, for a considerable time kept *holy, Satur- “ day*

“ *day to the Jewish; and Sunday to the Christian, Religion.*”

If I make any gross Mistake, I hope, I shall be entitled to the Author's Compassion, from my treating this usage only as an Oversight.

Not to take no tice of the first, “ to prove
 “ it was only necessary, &c.” I never intended it as a Proof; only as an Illustration of the thing;
 “ that (these are my Words) the Observation of
 “ the Sabbath ceas'd; and the *Jews* at last were
 “ satisfied that *the Law profited nothing*; that the
 “ Christian Religion had fulfill'd it, and super-
 “ seded all but the *moral* part of it: so might
 “ they think that every part of this *Decree* of a posi-
 “ tive nature should cease too.”—As their fond-
 ness for both abated, they might drop the Ob-
 servance of them both—but this is not the point.

What I chiefly complain of, is, that I am represented and argued against as if I had asserted, that *they who came over to Christianity*, included *Gentile*, as well as *Jewish*, Converts; accordingly he answers, “ that had the Apostles in the same
 “ manner declared it to be amongst *the necessary*
 “ *things*, that the Converts from *among the Gen-*
 “ *tiles*, should keep holy the *Jewish* Sabbath or
 “ Saturday, I do not see how we could have
 “ been excused from the Observance of it.”

Nor can I, if it be one of the *ten*, “ which are
 “ confessedly of a moral and perpetual Obliga-
 “ tion;”——it would lead me out of my way to dispute with him about the morality of the fourth Commandment.—Whatever the *Jews* might think on't, it is very far from being *confessedly* allow'd so amongst the Christians.—Tho' it is
 reason-

reasonable and highly fitting that some part of our time should be dedicated to the Service of God; yet whether that should have been the sixth, seventh, or eighth day, who could have determin'd, had not God in memory of the Creation required us *to keep holy the seventh day*.—The *Jews* had their *Seventh* in memory of their Deliverance out of the *Egyptian* Bondage; we, *ours* in memory of a much greater Deliverance from Sin and Satan by the death of *Christ*.—Where is then the moral and perpetual Obligation of the *Jewish* Sabbath?—

I refer the Reader to those excellent Sermons, upon this Subject, of our great and good Christian Casuist Archbishop *Sharp*—and beg leave, for his Satisfaction in this point, to quote one passage *. “ I will not be so positive, as some have
“ been, to affirm that the Observance of the Sab-
“ bath, is bound upon us by the Law of Na-
“ ture.”——If it be not, where is the moral obligation?——But to proceed.

Our Author reasons thus; “ It is certain that the
“ primitive Christians kept the *Jewish* Sabbath
“ religiously as an holy Day; but not as a day of
“ rest, *Judaically*; nay, at the same time they
“ did the one, they argued against the other.”

But, what is all this to me? I have not said one word about the *Jewish Sabbath* with relation to the *Gentile Converts*: It's very odd this Author should think I had—I'll put down my own words, and then the Reader may judge between us. “ It was thought *necessary* that the *Gentiles*
“ should be restrain'd from these things (such as
“ were

* Vol. 4. p. 258.

“ were in the Apostolical Decree) that no offence
 “ might be given to the *Jews*, who at present
 “ were zealous for the Law—and *those* that came
 “ over to Christianity were *indulged*, ’till their
 “ fondness for that way did abate; accordingly
 “ *they* for a considerable time kept *holy, Saturday*
 “ to the *Jewish*, and *Sunday* to the *Christian*,
 “ Religion.”

Now, who, I pray, were they that were indulg’d? the Heathen Converts would have thought it far from an *Indulgence* to be tied up to the Observance of the *Jewish Sabbath*---Can they be any other than the *Judaizing Christians*, zealous for the Law, till their fondness for that way did abate.--To what purpose then is all this arguing about the Gentile Converts?

The Author of the *Remarks* pleads thus, “ their p. 7
 “ (the Apostles) not determining, the Observance
 “ of the *Jewish Sabbath* to be a *necessary thing* is
 “ a strong argument with me, that the Decree
 “ relating to Blood was not merely to *avoid*
 “ *Scandal*; since if this was the true Reason
 “ and Intent of the Apostles in this part
 “ of the Decree; why should they not have required
 “ the new Converts from amongst the
 “ Gentiles to have kept the *Jewish Sabbath*: this
 “ being a Precept upon which they laid as much
 “ Stress as any—

For my part I am not able to discover the *Strength* of this Argument any more for this, than for several other parts of the *Law*; nay, no more, than for the Observance of the whole; which some very zealous *Jews* contended for, and thereby gave occasion to the making of this Decree—Why or upon what account, *It seem’d good to the Holy Ghost*, and the Apostles influenc’d thereby, to en-

join *these*, and no other, as *necessary*, I leave it to the Learned Author to determine—only would beg leave to remind Him, that the Apostles had Converts from among the Heathens to consider, as well as from the *Jews*; and probably would not give such a preference as to regard the *one*, and unnecessarily offend the *other*; but would so compromise the matter, as to give as little offence as possible to either.—What I am now urging, is pointed out by St. *James* upon the Occasion of this Decree; *My Sentence is, that we TROUBLE not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned unto God.*——But this has been under a full examination in the *Enquiry*, p. 31.

The Learned Author of the *Remarks* finds fault with the Observation upon the manner of this injunction; *from which if you keep yourselves, you shall do well*; “a Style not suited to a thing of a “perpetual Obligation:”——he startles at it, and quotes several passages to shew the contrary——It is, I own, but a low thing to contend about words and expressions——the Diction being left to the particular Genius of an inspired Writer.—But, as to the particular before us, some Criticks would not easily give it up, it being καλόν and καλῶς in the Instances he mentions, and εἰ in this; as if the one was doing a *good*, the other a *prudent*, thing, in the present Exigencies, that deserved praise——there is a difference between them.—Yet, since our *Translators* have not taken Notice of it, but render'd them alike, I will say no more of them; but leave this Remark to the Reader, to give it what weight he thinks it will bear——It is said upon St. *Matth.* xv. *Not that which goeth into the Mouth defileth a Man*, “that “this stands in direct Opposition to the *Jewish* “Notions

“ Notions about *Meats unclean*, and is look’d up-
 “ on by several of the Fathers and best Commen-
 “ tators to give us a Permission to make use of all
 “ things that are good for Food, without limi-
 “ tation or restraint.”—Upon this the Author of
 the *Remarks* wishes for an Account of all those
 Fathers, who look upon these Words as a Per-
 mission to eat Blood, and knows of none but St.
Austin; and he, it seems, does not talk very
 consistently.—He falls upon the Learned Mr.
Bingham about a misinterpretation of St. *Austin*—p. 28.
 That worthy Gentleman, to whom we are so
 much beholden for his excellent Performances,
 was so well acquainted with Fathers and the pri-
 mitive Church, that He could easily have grati-
 fied him in what he wishes for.—But for my
 own part, I shall not enter into a dry and tedious
 Enquiry into the number of Fathers and the Va-
 riety of their Sentiments upon this Subject.—I
 leave this Province to the Learned Author of the
Question stated, if he thinks fitting to engage in it;
 and, the Author of the *Remarks* in possession of
 his learned pains, in scraping together Fathers and
 Councils.

As to myself, I have freely own’d in the En-
 quiry, “ that it is very certain that a great many
 “ of the Fathers speak against it—and that it
 “ was the general practice of the Church for some
 “ Centuries to abstain—and so it continued
 “ whilst the *Jewish* Superstitions were adher’d to.
 “ When they began to wear off, and no Offence
 “ was given to any considerable number, which
 “ was worth their Pity and Regard; then this
 “ restriction might be taken away, and so probably
 “ it was in some Churches sooner than others.”
 This is the very Argument made use of by St.

Austin in this Author's quotation ; when the walls of partition betwixt *Jew* and *Gentile* were broken down, and there remained no *carnal Israelite* in the Church, the reason of Abstinence ceas'd ; and then follow'd the practice, as it is there represented.

It was the Opinion of several, that things *strangled* were not in the *Original Decree*—tho' probably they were mistaken ; yet perhaps the eating such might not be so offensive as *separate Blood* : therefore tho' the latter might be refused by some without much notice taken at their scrupulosity ; yet *the few* that refused the other, were laugh'd at, and made a jest of for so doing——

It seemed good to this Venerable Synod, to lay upon them no other Burden than these *necessary* things.—As to *Blood* and *things strangled* (about which is our present controversy) I ask why they are *necessary*? not in their own nature ; that *Revelation examin'd* declares against : “ The eating of
“ Blood, as such, was never imagin'd an Action,
“ simply and in itself sinful :” to which the Author of the *Remarks* agrees.—If it was then *necessary*, I ask upon what other account could it be thought so, than to *avoid Scandal*, as matters stood——and then I may well ask further, why it should be continued longer than the reason for making it did.—I must declare, I think, that no satisfactory Answer can be given to these questions, but upon the footing that I go on.—And if these things were put into the Decree to avoid *Scandal*, then some might be drop'd sooner than others, that continued to be look'd on as more offensive——

This I take to be the Case of things offered to Idols—the abhorrence of the *Jews* in the *Afri-*
can

can Church of *these Pollutions of Idols* might be greater than against things *strangled*; and so this Father would not permit a Traveller, “tho’ ready
 “to *perish for lack of Bread*, and tho’ no Man saw
 “him, to eat of such things as he was certain
 “had been offer’d to an Idol.” From whence the Author of the *Remarks* argues; “He (St. *Austin*)
 “did not think therefore as many think now-a-
 “days, that this part of the Apostolical Decree
 “was only obligatory in the Case of *Scandal*, but
 “in all Cases.”—If he did not think so, I am persuaded he thought wrong.—Was any Man in such an extreme want and no one saw him, and so no one could be offended, sure he would venture (I won’t except this Father) to supply his present Need; not doing it in honour of the Idol, but for *necessity*; which this Author allows, *has no Law*——But here lies the Matter; tho’ this p. 68.
 necessitous Person might not be seen, yet ’tis likely what this Father wrote, would——and he might not venture to give leave, lest he should hereby give offence.

The Author of the *Remarks* looks upon these words of our Saviour, *that which goeth into the Mouth*, &c. to be so far from taking off the restraint from Blood, “that they do not repeal the *Levitical* Law concerning the Distinction of Meats,” for which he assigns two Reasons; “1. Did not
 “our Saviour keep the Law of *Moses*, and require
 “others to do so?” —Yes, he did, as it was the Religion he was brought up in, ’till he could find an opportunity of substituting a better, *i. e.* his own, in its stead.—He walked circumspectly, that he might give the least offence; and so by these means watched the best opportunity of reclaiming them from the Error of their ways.—

And

Acts xvi. 3. And his Apostles follow'd his steps; *became all things to all Men, that they might gain some.* When St. Paul circumcised Timothy, the reason is assign'd, *because of the Jews, which were in those quarters.* On the same account he afterwards comply'd in purifying himself and four others that were with him, tho' He had preach'd that they ought *not to walk after the Customs* of the Jews.

Acts xxi. People, especially a stubborn and stiff-necked one, are not to be reformed at once: they must be wrought on by degrees.—If our Saviour and his Apostles had not acted with great Care and Caution, their Enemies would not have suffered them to have lived so long, 'till they had accomplished the great Errand they came about.

2ly, It's said, "Had the Apostles themselves understood these words, as taking away the Distinction of Meats, and making all *clean* and *pure* unto them, why was it necessary for St. Peter himself to have a *Vision* from Heaven to convince him of this truth, eight Years after our Saviour's Ascension into it? and he at that time declared, that he had never eaten any thing common or unclean."

Acts. x. 14. To this it may be answer'd, that Doctrines in opposition to the received Religion were deliver'd at first with great tenderness and some obscurity—a great many in Parables—that less offence might be taken—by degrees they proceeded to a clearer Discovery, as the other were able to bear it.—And so this *general* Assertion of our Saviour's might the more fully be explain'd by the *Vision* of St. Peter's—who, being the Apostle of the Jews, and very willing to *eat* or do any thing that would be an offence to them, might therefore be pitch'd on as the most proper Person to be convinced.

I can by no means think that our *Saviour* only oppos'd the foolish Notions of the *Pharisees*, as if Meats defiled by any natural turpitude; but likewise were levell'd at them, who kept up any superstitious Notions of their Impurity, as forbidden.—What is contained in this *general* assertion, is in particular explain'd in St. *Peter's* Vision——which sure may be a prudent and rational way of proceeding.

In answer to what is urged by the *Enquirer*, that our Saviour's Sentence is a general Grant; and the Apostolical Decree an Exception, purely to *avoid offence*--the *Remarker* asks, "if they had made this exception, because of the *present Occasion*, would they not, should they not have expressly declared so? as St. *Paul* does about not eating Meat whilst the World stands, lest I make my Brother to offend."

That they would not, we find in fact; that they should have declared so, I dare not presume to say.—How knows this Author, that these zealous *Jews* would not have been offended at such a Declaration?—Besides, there are some parts of the Decree of a perpetual Obligation, that such a Declaration would not have suited with—some artful or ill-designing Person would have thence concluded, that Fornication was not in itself sinful, but a temporary Command——

"Well, but after all, he says, this Author (meaning me) does in effect give up this *grand*, this *only* Answer; when he is so ingenuous as to say, that probably it might be *theirs* (the ^{P. 68.} Apostles reason in the Decree) *lest they make their Brother to offend*—so that at last all this *Certainty*, is dwindled into a *Probability*."

I congratulate this ingenious Author upon this wonderful Discovery—If he had pointed out some

some other Passages that carry along with them the reverse to an assuming Air, I can assure him, he would have given me no offence—I do not remember that I have gone into any positive dogmatical Assertions—If I had said *certainly* it was *theirs*, a remark, nay a rebuke would not have been ill thought of. Only, that he may not run away with such a Conclusion, let me tell him, that if he pleases to look upon this Word not to arise from any doubtfulness I had of the matter, *he shall do well*.

There are some Texts of Scripture further taken notice of by this Author—but as there does not appear any thing new to be said about them, I shall pass them by; and only take notice of the Conclusion, “that it is the *safest* to chuse that, “in which there is no danger of sinning.” But will not this throw us into endless Scruples? If we are still under the restraint from eating Blood, can we be certain, that it is only *that Blood* that is separate from the Creature, or designedly left in it? And then how can we tell what is designedly left in it; whether not that which runs from dressed Meat? and whether the *Gravy*, the most delicious part of the Meat, has not too great a mixture of Blood in it; or there be not too much, (if we abstain from that) of Blood in the Juices of the Meat?—Those that look upon this Decree still in force, have been variously perplex’d with these things.—For my own part, I pass Sentence upon no Man; and cannot but think it would shew a positive, non-commendable Temper in any one *that eateth not*, to judge him *that eateth*; as if he “bartered his Birth-right, or risked “his Inheritance in Heaven, for one Morsel of Meat.